V. REMARKS

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by either JP 11 188619 or Banks (U.S. Patent No. 4,373,991). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

JP 619 teaches a wafer polishing device. A wafer is held on a surface of a carrier plate and is abutted to a surface plate for polishing. A pressurizing head is abutted to the other surface of the carrier plate so as to press the wafer to the surface plate for polishing by the pressurizing the head. Simultaneously, when the wafer is polished by moving the wafer and the surface plate for polishing relatively, the pressurizing head is separated from the carrier plate during the polishing process and it is abutted again so as to slip the abutting position of the pressurizing head to the carrier plate at least one time.

Banks discloses an apparatus for polishing a semiconductor wafer. The semiconductor wafer is placed in a holder and then positioned on a polishing pad in a polishing machine. A mechanical force is applied to the holder to cause a predetermined pressure on the wafer therein as the polishing pad is rotated. Simultaneously, water at a pressure slightly higher than the pressure applied to the wafer is injected into the holder to form a water bearing layer between the wafer and the holder that permits free floating rotative motion of the wafer as it is being polished.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a wafer polishing method using a polishing apparatus which comprises a rotatable table having a polishing cloth adhered thereon and a polishing head equipped with a wafer holding plate opposing to the table and in which the back surface of the wafer is held by a holding surface of the wafer holding plate and the front surface of the wafer is pressed into contact with and polished by the polishing pad. Claim 1 recites

polishing step of polishing the front surface of the wafer to a predetermined total polishing stock removal without changing the polishing apparatus. Claim 1 further recites that the polishing step is divided into plural sub-steps and a holding position of the wafer in a subsequent sub-step is different from a holding position of the wafer in a previous sub-step. Additionally, claim 1 recites that the wafer and the polishing pad are separated from contact with one another between the plural sub-steps.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper because the applied art fails to teach each and every element of claim 1 as amended. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach that the wafer and the polishing pad are separated from contact with one another between the plural sub-steps of the polishing step as recited in claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over JP 11 188619 or Banks in view of Hattori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,372,593). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hattori discloses a method of manufacturing an SOI substrate includes the steps of: forming a silicon-germanium single-crystalline layer on a main surface of a bond wafer comprising a single crystal of silicon; forming a silicon single-crystalline layer on a surface of the silicon-germanium single-crystalline layer; oxidizing a surface of the silicon single-crystalline layer; bonding a base wafer comprising a single crystal of silicon to the oxidized surface of the silicon single-crystalline layer; heating the bond wafer and the base wafer for reinforcing the degree of adhesion therebetween; and removing the bond wafer.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claim is allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features it recites.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over JP 11 188619 or Banks. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claim is allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features it recites.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to submit those other reasons and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein in future papers.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance; the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of

the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 26, 2007

By: _____

David T. Nikaido
Reg. No. 22,663

Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal

DC263382.DOC